


10 and 12-15 were finally rejected under the doctrine of obviousness type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 2-7 of U.S. Patent No. 5,942,217 (Woo '217), over claims 1 and 6-12 of U.S. Patent No. 5,997,759 (Trinh '759) and over claims 1-4 of U.S. Patent No. 6,436,442 (Woo '442).

These rejections are traversed. While Applicant believes that the claims of the present application are distinguishable from those of Woo '217, Trinh '759 and Woo '442, to expedite prosecution, a Terminal Disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) and 37 CFR 1.130(b) is submitted herewith. The filing of a Terminal Disclaimer serves the statutory function of removing the rejection of double patenting, but does not raise presumption or estoppel on the merits of the rejection, *Quad Environmental Technology v. Union Sanitary District*, 20 U.S.P.Q. 1392 (Fed. Cir. 1991). It is therefore submitted that the rejections of claims 1-10 and 12-15 under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting are overcome. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

It is believed that this represents a complete response to the rejections under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting and places the present application in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and an early allowance are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

By:



Holly D. Kozlowski
Registration No. 30,468
DINSMORE & SHOHL LLP
1900 Chemed Center
255 East Fifth Street
Cincinnati, OH 45202
(513) 977-8568